

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herein, which place the application in condition for allowance.

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out that the Chinese reference filed in the previous Information Disclosure Statement did not include an English translation of the abstract. A copy of the abstract is included in the List of References Cited filed concurrently herewith.

Claims 1-45 were pending in this application. Claim 12 has been cancelled. Withdrawn claims 13-22, 25-27 and 29-45 are cancelled. Claims 1, 23 and 28 are amended. Claims 46-52 are added.

Claims 1, 23 and 28 are amended to recite that the 1-N- arylpyrazole is fipronil. Support is found throughout the specification as originally filed and in previously withdrawn (now cancelled) claims 21, 25, 32, 37 and 42. Claims 46-52 are added as dependent claims regarding the mixture of fipronil and amitraz. Support may be found, for example, on page 53-58 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

It is submitted that the claims, herewith and as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited in the Office Action, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. It is submitted that the amendments of the claims, as presented herein, are not made for purposes of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these amendments and additions are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. The issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action are addressed below in the order they appear in the Prior Action.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTIONS ARE OVERCOME

Claims 1-12, 23, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Soll *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,262,214).

Applicants respectfully believe that Soll should have been cited under 35 U.S.C. § 103 instead of 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and respectfully submit that the previously filed statement of common ownership obviates the rejection.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are respectfully requested.